

some stability as they look to get back to work. I look forward to moving to this bill, passing it, and working with the House to restore unemployment insurance benefits as we continue working to improve the health of the American economy.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HELLER. I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until the Senate recesses at 12:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HELLER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that after the completion of my remarks, the distinguished Senator from Kansas then be able to give his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension Act of 2014. In my view, this legislation is flawed in many respects, and that being the case, I intend to vote against it.

First and foremost, it needs to be said that the fact that we are even having a debate about extending unemployment benefits is unfortunate. Throughout the Obama administration, our Nation has been plagued with lackluster job growth, lower and lower rates of labor force participation, and high levels of long-term unemployment. Indeed, under this President it has been harder to find a job than at any other point in our Nation's recent history.

But, as has been said before, these are just symptoms of a much larger

problem. The plight of the long-term unemployed—which this bill is supposed to address—is not the major problem facing America today. Instead, the major problem is that despite the best efforts of many of us in Congress, our government hasn't done enough to foster economic growth. In fact, more often than not in recent years government has stood in the way. It has been an impediment.

We are now more than 5 years into this administration, and it is becoming increasingly clear that President Obama does not have a plan to address these problems. True enough, he has proposals that would expand the government and redistribute income but nothing resembling a plan to promote growth in the private sector or to actually put people back to work. Many of the President's redistribution schemes end up costing labor supply and jobs, as the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has made clear with respect to ObamaCare and the President's proposed minimum wage hike.

Growth is what we should be debating, ideas and proposals that would actually grow our economy and help people find jobs. But instead we are here once again to debate an extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program, or EUC.

Let's talk about the EUC program for just a few minutes.

The proponents of this legislation have told us that extending "temporary" unemployment benefits is vital to our economy, but I think the facts tell a much different story. Between July 2008 when the program started and December 2013 when it expired, we spent roughly \$265 billion on EUC benefits. That is more than a quarter of a trillion dollars on a temporary Federal benefit program. For much of that time the program paid up to 73 weeks of Federal benefits, amounting to a record total of 99 available weeks of unemployment benefits when you add the State and Federal benefits together. All told, we have paid EUC benefits for 66 months, which is 2½ years longer than any similar emergency unemployment program in U.S. history.

In other words, EUC is a program with a long track record, and when we look at the record, we see that it hasn't had the positive economic impact proponents of the program often claim it has. Indeed, despite the hundreds of billions of dollars in benefits we have already paid under this program, we have suffered through the worst jobs recovery in our Nation's history, and the long-term unemployed have suffered the most.

There is evidence to suggest this program has actually made the recovery worse. For example, according to recent research published by the National Bureau of Economic Research, "unemployment benefit extensions can account for most of the persistently high unemployment after the Great Recession."

So while some Democrats have claimed that extending unemployment benefits is the best way to create jobs, the facts certainly tell a different story.

I am not going to condemn anyone for wanting to extend a helping hand to those who continue to face difficulties under the Obama economy, but if we are going to debate yet another extension of Federal unemployment benefits, we should at the very least get our facts straight.

So with all this in mind—the cost of the EUC program and the questionable benefits—let's take a look at the legislation before us now.

One thing I would like to point out is that with this legislation we have once again abandoned regular order and bypassed the committee process entirely. I have remarked on this problem here on the floor several times before. When we ignore the traditional role of the Senate committees, we short-circuit the legislative process, and more often than not we end up with an inferior product. This bill is certainly no exception.

We learned this last month when the National Association of State Workforce Agencies, NASWA, sent a letter to the Senate outlining its concern with this bill. Chief among these concerns was that it would be extremely difficult for States to retroactively pay unemployment insurance claims, as this bill would require. Indeed, according to NASWA, backdating EUC claims "would make it nearly impossible" to apply individual State work search requirements, which is a key factor in determining eligibility for unemployment insurance. In addition, the letter indicated that there would likely be a large increase in new EUC overpayments as a result of this retroactivity requirement.

Due to these concerns and others, NASWA concluded that it would take States up to 3 months to implement this legislation, which is problematic because although the bill before us is technically for a 5-month extension, only 2 months of benefits would be paid prospectively. In other words, many States would not be ready to implement this legislation by the time it expires.

This is more than a glitch or a bump in the road; it is State workforce agencies—the very people who will have to implement this legislation on a day-to-day basis—telling the Senate that this bill is unworkable. According to the NASWA letter, there are a number of States that would consider not participating in the program due to these problems and the short time available to address them.

Labor Secretary Perez sent his own letter in response to NASWA's statement, promising to help States address these concerns. Oddly enough, however, this letter was very short on actual details as to how that assistance would be offered.